

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 17:56:28 -0600

From: Andrew Mason <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Organization: Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason

To: tecann <tecann@pacbell.net>

Mr. Canning,

This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.

1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.
2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.
3. Paper on the single bullet theory.
4. Misc. sight line analyses.

This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in my next email.

I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should interest you.

Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>

Best regards,

Andrew Mason

> tecann wrote:

>

> The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap
> resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a
> lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipate that use
> of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent
> substitutes of sbcglobal.net will probably survive longer. T
> he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably
> work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so
> I'm winging it.

>

> I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic
> ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying
> on memory, to wit:

>

> Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the staff of Ames
> Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
> Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research
> Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph
> No. 138.

>

> If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I
> am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being

Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason

Barristers and Solicitors

Garth W. Sandstrom, Q.C., Counsel

Geoffrey D. Dufour, LL.B.

Kevin W. Scott, B.A., LL.B.

Gordon W. Phelps, B.A., M.B.A., LL.B.

Andrew M. Mason, B.A., LL.B.

Nancy C. Brown, B.A., M.A., LL.B.

400-135 Twenty-First Street East
SASKATOON, SK S7K 0B4

Phone: (306) 244-2201

Fax: (306) 244-2420

Direct Line: (306) 343-4831

Email: a.mason@dufourlaw.com

Web: www.dufourlaw.com

March 31, 2003

Thomas N. Canning
276 LaCuesta Drive
Portola Valley CA USA 94028

Dear Mr. Canning:

RE: JFK assassination

It was a delight to speak with you at some length on this very interesting subject. I am enclosing copies of the papers that I mentioned. I have also added copies of some other photo sight line analyses that seem to support the position of Governor Connally in the middle of his seat.

As I mentioned, my disagreement with your placement of Connally, and my disagreement with the single bullet theory, does not lead me to support a conspiracy theory. It simply causes me to look at an entirely different shooting scenario in which Governor Connally was hit much later than most people think. When one investigates the possibility that Governor Connally was hit at around frame 270, which is about when the second shot must have been fired if the shot pattern recalled by the vast majority of witnesses is correct, one finds some key indications that the Governor was hit at that point. I would be happy to discuss these with you. Remarkably, a second shot hit on Governor Connally at z270 fits just about everything - except the opinions of arm chair experts who are convinced that the Governor was reacting to being wounded in the chest just after he emerges from behind the Stemmons sign.

I don't know whether my work will persuade you about Connally's more central position and, therefore, the plausibility of my JFK neck to Connally thigh trajectory. I would be very interested in receiving your comments.

Yours truly,

DUFOUR SCOTT PHELPS & MASON

ANDREW M. MASON

AM:

Subject: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 14:35:48 -0800

From: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

To: <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foisting a lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipate that use of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent substitutes of sbcglobal.net will probably survive longer. The parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so I'm winging it.

I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying on memory, to wit:

Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the staff of Ames Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph No. 138.

If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and opinion.

The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is associated with the Synchrotron facility.

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:46:51 -0700

From: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

To: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Mr. Mason, I doubt that our discussion could have been more enjoyable for you than it was for me. I have devoured your hard copies of papers on the JFK-associated papers. It is amusing to me to observe my reaction to reinforcement of my ideas and to see my immediate moves to justify my earlier conclusions and to explain them on the basis of other evidence shown. I am becoming more scatterbrained with advancing age, so my subsequent comments herein must be read with this decay in mind. The explanation for the eclipse of Connally's shoulder by the limo body or by the back of the jump seat is quite persuasive; I am moved to suggest that my testimony could well be revised to refer to the right side of Connally's head and not his shoulder would be appropriate. The resulting shift would not destroy the conclusion I drew. In another figure taken from one of the papers showing a photo taken through a telescopic sight during a reenactment of the event suggests that Connally was lucky and that it would have been difficult for the bullet to strike his thigh without killing him first.

I have had several occasions to look at many pictures of JFK and have concluded that he was turned further beyond a pure profile position than my analysis with the calibration pictures taken at the FAA laboratory. I believe that I was misled to some extent by the confusing background image of Mrs. K's pink suit and the lapel "notch" in her blouse. The resulting striking exaggeration of his nose size which resulted caused me to settle on a figure of that was as much as ten degrees too much to K's right. Oh! for photo resolution superior to that attainable with an amateur's 8mm camera!

A personal comment which I hope will be taken as intended to support your admirable effort at squeezing out all the reliable data from the raft of evidence available: You speak of "arm-chair experts". judgemental comments of this sort are doubtless valuable in adversarial discourse, but they do not strengthen your conclusions in what is essentially a scientific or at least objective discussion. Your explanation of the power of simultaneous eye-witness evidence impressed me particularly in view of my recently recognized poor performance in a stressful situation involving "freeway rage". I was able to reconstruct a minor incident and found that my recollection of the actions of another driver was so poor that I would be well advised to claim that I observed nothing of value.

I am typing this note after a complicated day and am sure that I should send this off to let you know at least a bit of my responses to your questions. I will try to add to the responses, but as you probably have realized I tend to wander.

Please feel to press me further if you conclude that I may be of assistance. I am a bit curious to learn what moved you to go into the JFK subject.

Sincerely, Tom Canning

----- Original Message -----

From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 4:56 PM

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

> *Mr. Canning,*

>

> *This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to*

> you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.
>
> 1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.
>
> 2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.
>
> 3. Paper on the single bullet theory.
>
> 4. Misc. sight line analyses.
>
> This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in
> my next email.
>
> I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should
> interest you.
>
> Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in
> the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next
> year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research
> and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web
> site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>
>
> Best regards,
>
> Andrew Mason
>
>
>
>
> > tecann wrote:
> >
> > The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap
> > resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a
> > lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipste that use
> > of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent
> > substitutes of sbcglobal.net will praobably survive longer. T
> > he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably
> > work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so
> > I'm winging it.
> >
> > I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic
> > ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying
> > on memory, to wit:
> >
> > Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the stagg of Ames
> > Research Center, National Aeronautica and Space Administration,
> > Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research
> > Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph
> > No. 138.
> >
> > If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I
> > am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being
> > as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and
> > opinion.
> >
> > The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is
> > associated with the Synchrotron facility.

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 16:07:45 -0700

From: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

To: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Andrew: Your question regarding the shot pattern's consistency with the single bullet is unclear in my mind. As to the effect of using Betzner's photo to limit the rightward range of Connally's possible location when he was hit, I conclude that the side of Connally's head is likely to be about seven to eight inches to the left of his shoulder so that "moving" him to his right to the maximum "allowed" by Betzner's picture still does not put his torso out of position to have received the bullet on its way from K's throat to C's thigh. I somehow don't envision a further reenactment getting funded to satisfy our curiosity. Another question occurred to me several years ago: Could the first shot have gotten lost in the rather voluminous space between the rear seats' back and the Limo's trunk? I asked a few informal questions aimed at the museum where it is stored (at that time) and was told that it was "all crated up and was unavailable". Since nothing of importance would be gained by examining this I haven't bothered further.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2003 1:37 PM

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

> Mr. Canning,

>

> Thank you very much for taking the time to read my material so
> carefully and to reply. My comments are set out below in the body
> of your remarks.

>

> Andrew Mason

>

> tecann wrote:

> >

> > Mr. Mason,

> > You can call me Andrew.

>

> > I doubt that our discussion could have been more enjoyable for
> > you than it was for me. I have devoured your hard copies of papers on
the

> > JFK-associated papers. It is amusing to me to observe my reaction to
> > reinforcement of my ideas and to see my immediate moves to justify my
> > earlier conclusions and to explain them on the basis of other evidence
> > shown. I am becoming more scatterbrained with advancing age, so my
> > subsequent comments herein must be read with this decay in mind.

> > The explanation for the eclipse of Connally's shoulder by the limo body
or by

> > the back of the jump seat is quite persuasive; I am moved to suggest
that my

> > testimony could well be revised to refer to the right side of Connally's
head

> > and not his shoulder would be appropriate. The resulting shift would
not

> > destroy the conclusion I drew.

>

> I have attached a page showing the placement of the head if
> Betzner's line of sight to the left side of JFK's left shoulder
> passes just to the right side of Connally's head. It puts JBC's
> head in the middle of the seat, which is where it seems to be on

> the basis of the other sight line analyses.
>
> > In another figure taken from one of the
> > papers showing a photo taken through a telescopic sight during a
> > reenactment of the event suggests that Connally was lucky and that it
would
> > have been difficult for the bullet to strike his thigh without killing
him
> > first.
>
> Are you referring to the FBI photos using the Cadillac limousine?
> (page 7 of my paper). If so, I would agree with you completely.
> That is why, I think, Arlen Specter concluded the same thing. The
> problem with that re-enactment, of course, is that they used the
> wrong car.
>
> I think Connally was turned enough to his right at z200 (the
> zfilm shows his shoulders to be facing almost directly to the
> right) for the bullet to have passed to his left - perhaps
> grazing the back of the jacket - and directly into the thigh. The
> only way we will ever be sure is to do a reconstruction using the
> right car.
>
> > I have had several occasions to look at many pictures of JFK and have
> > concluded that he was turned further beyond a pure profile position
than my
> > analysis with the calibration pictures taken at the FAA laboratory. I
> > believe that I was misled to some extent by the confusing background
image
> > of Mrs. K's pink suit and the lapel "notch" in her blouse. The
resulting
> > striking exaggeration of his nose size which resulted caused me to
settle on
> > a figure of that was as much as ten degrees too much to K's right.
Oh!
> > for photo resolution superior to that attainable with an amateur's 8mm
> > camera!
>
> Do you have the Zapruder film on DVD? (I suppose I should ask if
> you have a DVD player). The quality of that copy ("Image of An
> Assassination" MPI Video:
>
<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/630507190X/103-9788707-4065459?vi=glance>
>)
>
> >
> > A personal comment which I hope will be taken as intended to support
your
> > admirable effort at squeezing out all the reliable data from the raft
of
> > evidence available: You speak of "arm-chair experts".
>
> I am not sure what you are referring to there.
>
> > judgemental comments
> > of this sort are doubtless valuable in adversarial discourse, but they
do
> > not strengthen your conclusions in what is essentially a scientific or
at
> > least objective discussion.
>

> Good point. I'll try to tone that down a little. Thanks.
>
> > Your explanation of the power of simultaneous
> > eye-witness evidence impressed me particularly in view of my recently
> > recognized poor performance in a stresssful situation involving "freeway
> > rage". I was able to reconstruct a minor incident and found that my
> > recollection of the actions of another driver was so poor that I would
be
> > well advised to claim that I observed nothing of value.
>
> Do you agree with my conclusion that the first shot was followed
> by a pause and then two relatively more rapid shots, the last two
> being closer together than the first two? If so, that would
> eliminate a second shot SBT as a possibility.
>
> >
> > I am typing this note after a complicated day and am sure that I should
send
> > this off to let you know at least a bit of my responses to your
questions. I
> > will try to add to the responses, but as you probably have realized I
tend
> > to wander.
> >
> > Please feel to press me further if you conclude that I may be af
assistance.
>
> One thing you might want to consider is supporting a proposal
> that I would like to make to the US Department of Justice for a
> re-enactment using the right limousine and a testing of the
> "revised SBT" in which the first bullet struck Connally in the
> thigh only.
>
> > I am a bit curious to learn what moved you to go into the JFK subject.
>
> Its a bit of a long story - it started with a legal paper on
> expert evidence.
>
> Thanks again for your interest and your comments.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Andrew Mason
>
> >
> > Sincerely, Tom Canning
> > ----- Original Message -----
> > From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>
> > To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>
> > Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 4:56 PM
> > Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003
> >
> > > Mr. Canning,
> > >
> > > This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to
> > > you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.
> > >
> > > 1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.
> > >
> > > 2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.
> > >
> > > 3. Paper on the single bullet theory.

> > >
> > > 4. Misc. sight line analyses.
> > >
> > > This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in
> > > my next email.
> > >
> > > I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should
> > > interest you.
> > >
> > > Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in
> > > the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next
> > > year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research
> > > and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web
> > > site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>
> > >
> > > Best regards,
> > >
> > > Andrew Mason
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > tecann wrote:
> > >
> > > The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap
> > > > resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a
> > > > lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipste that use
> > > > of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent
> > > > substitutes of sbcglobal.net will praobably survive longer. T
> > > > he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably
> > > > work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so
> > > > I'm winging it.
> > > >
> > > > I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic
> > > > ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying
> > > > on memory, to wit:
> > > >
> > > > Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the stagg of Ames
> > > > Research Center, National Aeronautica and Space Administration,
> > > > Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research
> > > > Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph
> > > > No. 138.
> > > >
> > > > If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I
> > > > am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being
> > > > as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and
> > > > opinion.
> > > >
> > > > The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is
> > > > associated with the Synchrotron facility.

> as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and
> opinion.
>
> The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is
> associated with the Synchrotron facility.

[Andrew Mason](mailto:a.mason@dufourlaw.com) <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason
Barristers & Solicitors

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 14:37:37 -0600

From: Andrew Mason <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Organization: Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason

To: tecann <tecann@pacbell.net>

Mr. Canning,

Thank you very much for taking the time to read my material so carefully and to reply. My comments are set out below in the body of your remarks.

Andrew Mason

tecann wrote:

>
> *Mr. Mason,*
You can call me Andrew.

> *I doubt that our discussion could have been more enjoyable for
> you than it was for me. I have devoured your hard copies of papers on the
> JFK-associated papers. It is amusing to me to observe my reaction to
> reinforcement of my ideas and to see my immediate moves to justify my
> earlier conclusions and to explain them on the basis of other evidence
> shown. I am becoming more scatterbrained with advancing age, so my
> subsequent comments herein must be read with this decay in mind.
> The explanation for the eclipse of Connally's shoulder by the limo body or by
> the back of the jump seat is quite persuasive; I am moved to suggest that my
> testimony could well be revised to refer to the right side of Connally's head
> and not his shoulder would be appropriate. The resulting shift would not
> destroy the conclusion I drew.*

I have attached a page showing the placement of the head if Betzner's line of sight to the left side of JFK's left shoulder passes just to the right side of Connally's head. It puts JBC's head in the middle of the seat, which is where it seems to be on the basis of the other sight line analyses.

> *In another figure taken from one of the
> papers showing a photo taken through a telescopic sight during a
> reenactment of the event suggests that Connally was lucky and that it would
> have been difficult for the bullet to strike his thigh without killing him
> first.*

Are you referring to the FBI photos using the Cadillac limousine? (page 7 of my paper). If so, I would agree with you completely. That is why, I think, Arlen Specter concluded the same thing. The problem with that re-enactment, of course, is that they used the wrong car.

I think Connally was turned enough to his right at z200 (the zfilm shows his shoulders to be facing almost directly to the right) for the bullet to have passed to his left - perhaps grazing the back of the jacket - and directly into the thigh. The only way we will ever be sure is to do a reconstruction using the right car.

> *I have had several occasions to look at many pictures of JFK and have
> concluded that he was turned further beyond a pure profile position than my
> analysis with the calibration pictures taken at the FAA laboratory. I
> believe that I was misled to some extent by the confusing background image*

> of Mrs. K's pink suit and the lapel "notch" in her blouse. The resulting
> striking exaggeration of his nose size which resulted caused me to settle on
> a figure of that was as much as ten degrees too much to K's right. Oh!
> for photo resolution superior to that attainable with an amateur's 8mm
> camera!

Do you have the Zapruder film on DVD? (I suppose I should ask if you have a DVD player). The quality of that copy ("Image of An Assassination" MPI Video:

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/630507190X/103-9788707-4065459?vi=glan>
)

>
> A personal comment which I hope will be taken as intended to support your
> admirable effort at squeezing out all the reliable data from the raft of
> evidence available: You speak of "arm-chair experts".

I am not sure what you are referring to there.

> judgemental comments
> of this sort are doubtless valuable in adversarial discourse, but they do
> not strengthen your conclusions in what is essentially a scientific or at
> least objective discussion.

Good point. I'll try to tone that down a little. Thanks.

> Your explanation of the power of simultaneous
> eye-witness evidence impressed me particularly in view of my recently
> recognized poor performance in a stressssful situation involving "freeway
> rage". I was able to reconstruct a minor incident and found that my
> recollection of the actions of another driver was so poor that I would be
> well advised to claim that I observed nothing of value.

Do you agree with my conclusion that the first shot was followed by a pause and then two relatively more rapid shots, the last two being closer together than the first two? If so, that would eliminate a second shot SBT as a possibility.

>
> I am typing this note after a complicated day and am sure that I should send
> this off to let you know at least a bit of my responses to your questions. I
> will try to add to the responses, but as you probably have realized I tend
> to wander.
>
> Please feel to press me further if you conclude that I may be af assistance.

One thing you might want to consider is supporting a proposal that I would like to make to the US Department of Justice for a re-enactment using the right limousine and a testing of the "revised SBT" in which the first bullet struck Connally in the thigh only.

> I am a bit curious to learn what moved you to go into the JFK subject.

Its a bit of a long story - it started with a legal paper on expert evidence.


Thanks again for your interest and your comments.

Best regards,

Andrew Mason

>
> Sincerely, Tom Canning
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>
> To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>
> Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 4:56 PM
> Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003
>
> > Mr. Canning,
> >
> > This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to
> > you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.
> >
> > 1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.
> >
> > 2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.
> >
> > 3. Paper on the single bullet theory.
> >
> > 4. Misc. sight line analyses.
> >
> > This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in
> > my next email.
> >
> > I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should
> > interest you.
> >
> > Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in
> > the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next
> > year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research
> > and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web
> > site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>
> >
> > Best regards,
> >
> > Andrew Mason
> >
> >
> >
> > > tecann wrote:
> > >
> > > The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap
> > > resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a
> > > lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipste that use
> > > of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent
> > > substitutes of sbcglobal.net will praobably survive longer. T
> > > he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably
> > > work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so
> > > I'm winging it.
> > >
> > > I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic
> > > ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying
> > > on memory, to wit:
> > >
> > > Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the stagg of Ames
> > > Research Center, National Aeronautica and Space Administration,
> > > Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research
> > > Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph
> > > No. 138.
> > >

> > > *If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I*
> > > *am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being*
> > > *as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and*
> > > *opinion.*
> > >
> > > *The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is*
> > > *associated with the Synchrotron facility.*

 Page16_jfk_sbt.pdf	Name: Page16_jfk_sbt.pdf Type: Acrobat (application/pdf) Encoding: base64
--	--

<p>Andrew Mason <a.mason@dufourlaw.com> Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason Barristers & Solicitors</p>
--

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2003 11:08:03 -0600

From: Andrew Mason <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Organization: Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason

To: tecann <tecann@pacbell.net>

Tom,

Thanks for your reply.

Re the shot pattern and the SBT: In order to accommodate the 1.....2...3 shot pattern, the second shot has to be after the mid point between the first and last shots. We know when the third shot occurred: frame 312-313. If there were two shots before JFK emerged from behind the sign (frame z224) at which time he is already reacting to being shot through the neck, then the first shot must have occurred more than 89 frames before z224, ie. well before frame 135 in order to have the second shot occur before z224 AND before the midpoint between 1 and 3. We know that such an early shot did not occur.

There is an overwhelming convergence on the first shot being after z186 which is when Betzner took his photo and very close to z202 which is when Willis took his photo (Willis said he pressed the shutter at the instant of the first shot). There is also all the evidence of the 'ear-witnesses' that the last two shots were quite close together and about as fast as a rifle could be fired twice. 89 frames (almost 5 seconds) would be too long between the last two shots.

Thus we see that the 1.....2...3 shot pattern eliminates the possibility of a first shot missing. So this eliminates any possibility of a SBT on the second shot. But this is not all that surprising since all the witnesses who saw JFK at the time of the first shot said he reacted immediately by leaning to his left and putting his hands to his head.

Re Connally's position in the car: I agree with you that moving Connally to his right to the maximum allowed by Betzner's picture still does not put his torso out of position to have received the bullet on its way from JFK's throat to C's thigh. But it does seem to me that it puts his RIGHT SIDE out of position to have received a bullet traveling on a right to left trajectory through JFK's neck. With Connally in the center of his seat and with JFK as far right as he can be placed, the bullet (travelling right to left at an angle of 13 degrees) still passes to the left of JBC's spine.

Now we know, of course, that it did not hit JBC in the torso on the left side. The only wound on his left side is the wound in his left thigh. The question is, could the bullet have missed his torso and struck his thigh directly? The answer, I believe, is YES. I have shown how that may have happened in the photograph from behind (page 19 of the SBT paper) with Connally's torso turned somewhat to the right. Connally is actually turned more than this to the right from z180-207 or so.

Re First bullet getting caught up in the back behind the rear seat. While it is an interesting hypothesis, the car was examined carefully by FBI agents in the White House garage immediately after the assassination. There was no evidence of a bullet striking the car anywhere apart from the windshield and mirror.

While I suppose it could have passed through what looks like a vent hole behind the top of the rear seat, the evidence against such a possibility seems strong:

1. JFK reacted to the first shot
2. there was only one shot before JFK began reacting (based on the 1.....2...3 shot pattern)
3. the car was completely remodeled after the assassination and all the seats were removed. The prospect of the bullet causing no visible damage to the seats when removed seems rather hard to understand.

Re Utility of a new re-enactment: The point here is that there has never been a proper re-enactment done with the right automobile. With the right automobile, we could place Connally and JFK in exactly the same positions seen in the Zapruder film at the exact same spots and plot the trajectory very accurately. I believe it would show that the SBT trajectory from JFK's neck to Connally's right armpit is impossible with the occupants in these positions. Unless we do the re-enactment, we can only go by distances and angles. We can't "see" the trajectory.

Best regards,

Andrew Mason

tecann wrote:

>
> Andrew: Your question regarding the shot pattern's consistency with the
> single bullet is unclear in my mind.

See above.

> As to the effect of using Betzners's
> photo to limit the rightward range of Connaly's possible location when he
> was hit, I conclude that the side of Connaly's head is likely to be about
> seven to eight inches to the left of his shoulder so that "moving" him to
> his right to the maximum "allowed" by Betzner's picture still does not put
> his torso out of position to have received the bullet on its way from K's
> throat to C's thigh. I somehow don't envision a further reenactment getting
> funded to satisfy our curiosity. Another question occurred to me several
> years ago: Could the first shot have gotten lost in the rather voluminous
> space between the rear seats' back and the Limo's trunk? I asked a few
> informal questions aimed at the museum where it is stored (at that time)
> and was told that it was "all crated up and was unavailable". Since nothing
> of importance would be gained by examining this I haven't bothered further.

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

> To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

> Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2003 1:37 PM

> Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

>

> > Mr. Canning,

> >

> > Thank you very much for taking the time to read my material so
> > carefully and to reply. My comments are set out below in the body
> > of your remarks.

> >

> > Andrew Mason

> >

> > tecann wrote:

> > >

> > > Mr. Mason,
> > You can call me Andrew.
> >
> > > I doubt that our discussion could have been more enjoyable for
> > > you than it was for me. I have devoured your hard copies of papers on
> > the
> > > JFK-associated papers. It is amusing to me to observe my reaction to
> > > reinforcement of my ideas and to see my immediate moves to justify my
> > > earlier conclusions and to explain them on the basis of other evidence
> > > shown. I am becoming more scatterbrained with advancing age, so my
> > > subsequent comments herein must be read with this decay in mind.
> > > The explanation for the eclipse of Connally's shoulder by the limo body
> > or by
> > > the back of the jump seat is quite persuasive; I am moved to suggest
> > that my
> > > testimony could well be revised to refer to the right side of Connally's
> > head
> > > and not his shoulder would be appropriate. The resulting shift would
> > not
> > > destroy the conclusion I drew.
> >
> > I have attached a page showing the placement of the head if
> > Betzner's line of sight to the left side of JFK's left shoulder
> > passes just to the right side of Connally's head. It puts JBC's
> > head in the middle of the seat, which is where it seems to be on
> > the basis of the other sight line analyses.
> >
> > > In another figure taken from one of the
> > > papers showing a photo taken through a telescopic sight during a
> > > reenactment of the event suggests that Connally was lucky and that it
> > would
> > > have been difficult for the bullet to strike his thigh without killing
> > him
> > > first.
> >
> > > Are you referring to the FBI photos using the Cadillac limousine?
> > (page 7 of my paper). If so, I would agree with you completely.
> > That is why, I think, Arlen Specter concluded the same thing. The
> > problem with that re-enactment, of course, is that they used the
> > wrong car.
> >
> > I think Connally was turned enough to his right at z200 (the
> > zfilm shows his shoulders to be facing almost directly to the
> > right) for the bullet to have passed to his left - perhaps
> > grazing the back of the jacket - and directly into the thigh. The
> > only way we will ever be sure is to do a reconstruction using the
> > right car.
> >
> > > I have had several occasions to look at many pictures of JFK and have
> > > concluded that he was turned further beyond a pure profile position
> > than my
> > > analysis with the calibration pictures taken at the FAA laboratory. I
> > > believe that I was misled to some extent by the confusing background
> > image
> > > of Mrs. K's pink suit and the lapel "notch" in her blouse. The
> > resulting
> > > striking exaggeration of his nose size which resulted caused me to
> > settle on
> > > a figure of that was as much as ten degrees too much to K's right.
> > Oh!
> > > for photo resolution superior to that attainable with an amateur's 8mm
> > > camera!

> >
> > Do you have the Zapruder film on DVD? (I suppose I should ask if
> > you have a DVD player). The quality of that copy ("Image of An
> > Assassination" MPI Video:
> >
> <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/630507190X/103-9788707-4065459>
> ?vi=glance
> >)
> >
> > >
> > > A personal comment which I hope will be taken as intended to support
> your
> > > admirable effort at squeezing out all the reliable data from the raft
> of
> > > evidence available: You speak of "arm-chair experts".
> >
> > I am not sure what you are referring to there.
> >
> > > judgemental comments
> > > of this sort are doubtless valuable in adversarial discourse, but they
> do
> > > not strengthen your conclusions in what is essentially a scientific or
> at
> > > least objective discussion.
> >
> > Good point. I'll try to tone that down a little. Thanks.
> >
> > > Your explanation of the power of simultaneous
> > > eye-witness evidence impressed me particularly in view of my recently
> > > recognized poor performance in a stressssful situation involving "freeway
> > > rage". I was able to reconstruct a minor incident and found that my
> > > recollection of the actions of another driver was so poor that I would
> be
> > > well advised to claim that I observed nothing of value.
> >
> > Do you agree with my conclusion that the first shot was followed
> > by a pause and then two relatively more rapid shots, the last two
> > being closer together than the first two? If so, that would
> > eliminate a second shot SBT as a possibility.
> >
> > >
> > > I am typing this note after a complicated day and am sure that I should
> send
> > > this off to let you know at least a bit of my responses to your
> questions. I
> > > will try to add to the responses, but as you probably have realized I
> tend
> > > to wander.
> > >
> > > Please feel to press me further if you conclude that I may be af
> assistance.
> >
> > One thing you might want to consider is supporting a proposal
> > that I would like to make to the US Department of Justice for a
> > re-enactment using the right limousine and a testing of the
> > "revised SBT" in which the first bullet struck Connally in the
> > thigh only.
> >
> > > I am a bit curious to learn what moved you to go into the JFK subject.
> >
> > Its a bit of a long story - it started with a legal paper on
> > expert evidence.

> >
> > *Thanks again for your interest and your comments.*
> >
> > *Best regards,*
> >
> > *Andrew Mason*
> >
> > >
> > > *Sincerely, Tom Canning*
> > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > *From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>*
> > > *To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>*
> > > *Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 4:56 PM*
> > > *Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003*
> > >
> > > > *Mr. Canning,*
> > > >
> > > > *This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to*
> > > > *you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.*
> > > >
> > > > *1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.*
> > > >
> > > > *2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.*
> > > >
> > > > *3. Paper on the single bullet theory.*
> > > >
> > > > *4. Misc. sight line analyses.*
> > > >
> > > > *This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in*
> > > > *my next email.*
> > > >
> > > > *I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should*
> > > > *interest you.*
> > > >
> > > > *Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in*
> > > > *the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next*
> > > > *year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research*
> > > > *and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web*
> > > > *site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>*
> > > >
> > > > *Best regards,*
> > > >
> > > > *Andrew Mason*
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > *tecann wrote:*
> > > > >
> > > > > *The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap*
> > > > > *resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a*
> > > > > *lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipate that use*
> > > > > *of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent*
> > > > > *substitutes of sbcglobal.net will probably survive longer. T*
> > > > > *he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably*
> > > > > *work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so*
> > > > > *I'm winging it.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic*
> > > > > *ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying*
> > > > > *on memory, to wit:*
> > > > >
> > > > >

> > > > *Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the stagg of Ames
> > > > Research Center, National Aeronautica and Space Administration,
> > > > Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research
> > > > Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph
> > > > No. 138.
> > > >
> > > > If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I
> > > > am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being
> > > > as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and
> > > > opinion.
> > > >
> > > > The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is
> > > > associated with the Synchrotron facility.*

[Andrew Mason <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>](mailto:a.mason@dufourlaw.com)

Dufour Scott Phelps & Mason
Barristers & Solicitors